School leadership in the twenty-first century: different approaches to common problems?

Tony Townsend

Chair, Public Service, Educational Leadership and Management, School of Education, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

Abstract

This article identifies the major themes that emerge from the five selected articles in this special issue. Collectively, they demonstrate some trends occurring in the area of school leadership, but also show that individual countries are looking at these trends in different ways. It is an example of what might be called thinking globally but acting locally. The major trends that have been identified include the use of market terminology in educational settings, increased accountability and responsibility for school leaders, the move towards various strategies for distributing leadership beyond the principal and the increasing importance placed on the task of school leaders when it comes to promoting teaching and learning.

Introduction

The purpose of this special issue of School Leadership & Management is to look at what is happening in various parts of the world for educational leadership preparation to establish whether or not there are common ways of doing things that might be successful across different contexts. This issue contains articles that look at the state of the art in school leadership preparation and development in five countries: the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, Denmark and Hong Kong.

First, John MacBeath provides an overview of what is happening in the United Kingdom in 'No Lack of Principles: Leadership Development in England and Scotland'. It is a useful introduction for us because it advises us of the current situation, not only in the UK, but one that is common to many other parts of the world as well, where being the main leader in a school (head teacher, principal) is no longer seen as an attractive alternative by many of the people that we would have previously expected to take on the task. The complexity of the job and the lack of

comparative remuneration with those who are second in charge are conspiring to keep people at lower levels of leadership. This makes the task of finding and educating leaders not only urgent, with perhaps up to a quarter of heads in the UK retiring in the next five years or so, but difficult, as many potentially excellent leaders are choosing family or lifestyle over what is increasingly being seen as a stressful and perhaps thankless task.

MacBeath provides us with an overview of the two different approaches adopted in England and Scotland, with a focused approach through the work of the National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services in England and a consensus approach with partnerships between government and the Scottish universities in Scotland. In both cases, education for the certification of leaders (National Professional Qualification for Headship [NPQH] in England and Scottish Qualification for Headship [SQH] in Scotland) is embellished by a range of other programmes for middle level leaders and for accomplished teachers (such as the Chartered Teacher) that provide a pathway from the classroom to the front office.

Ira Bogotch's article, 'The State of the Art: Leadership Training and Development: US Perspectives: Above and Beyond Recorded History', provides us with enlightening information on the approach to the education of school leaders in the United States. Similar to MacBeath, although perhaps for different reasons, Bogotch expresses a level of concern for what is happening there. In this forthright overview of the American scene, Bogotch articulates his concerns about the substantially different perspectives of what is happening at the national or state policy level and what is happening in practice at the local level. He provides an excellent description of what might be considered by outsiders as a dysfunctional approach to the education of school leaders, where what is articulated at national policy level (that he calls recorded history) is subjected to local political interpretation and differences in values that are characterised by the state control of education, which leads to a situation where leaders educated in one state might have to retrain if they wish to move to another. All this indicates is that each state system is essentially different and separated from other states, despite the fact that there is a national set of leadership standards.

He then provides us with another distinguishing feature of the US education of school leaders in that the first step towards a position as principal of a school is made by individuals who choose to undertake a leadership programme at a university,

whether or not they appear to have any leadership skills. These people might complete this programme successfully, they may even pass the certification examination required by the state, yet still they may be seen by their local school district as not being eligible (qualified) for leadership positions. He also outlines the incredibly complex apparatus (from English and Papa 2010) that ensures the accountability of educational leadership programmes at national, regional, state and local levels. Given the difficulty of developing an understanding of leadership preparation from a national or even state perspective, Bogotch then provides a range of exemplars of local educational leadership programmes that seem to be able to provide students with a meaningful and valuable educational experience, whilst managing to work within the labyrinthine structures imposed by state and national authorities. It is here, he argues, that the way forward lies.

Steve Dinham, Michelle Anderson, Brian Caldwell, and Paul Weldon in 'Breakthroughs in School Leadership Development in Australia' provide us with a historical perspective of the development of leadership education that provides not only an understanding of how this has developed in Australia, but also a broader understanding of connections to the USA and other international developments. It tracks the research on school effectiveness and student outcomes to demonstrate the indirect but nevertheless important role that school leadership plays in improving student outcomes.

They agree with others that the role of the principal is changing rapidly and seems to be becoming increasingly complex. Change in society towards a more knowledge-based way of looking at the world has been accompanied by changing paradigms of leadership, ranging from organisational leadership, through management, and towards a strong focus on instructional leadership. They describe the increasing influence of leadership standards, where moving from leadership competency to capability (or capacity) has led to a reduction of the focus on things that we learned yesterday that can be measured today (competence) and towards a focus on the characteristics and skills we have today that might lead us in the future (capability). However they suggest that the current difficulties for leaders may have more to do with an aggregation of activities rather than changes in the ones they have always had. It is with this in mind that they look at distributed leadership as one strategy not only for building the capacity of the principal as sole leader of the school, but to ensure that the school as a whole is capable of moving forward by encouraging leadership in others as well.

The article provides an overview of two important research projects, the first on the new enterprise logic of schools (2004_07) and a second that frames the transformation of schools (2007_08), during which the notion of leadership as the formation of capital emerged. After establishing a series of elements (such as the student as the unit of organisation, the development of partnerships and leadership distribution) in the first project, the second identified four different types of capital, intellectual, social, spiritual and financial, that are required to transform schools. Being successful at generating these forms of capital becomes the measure of good leadership and this has implications for leadership development as well. It recognises the importance of context, such as the size of the school and whether or not the school leader teaches or not, and provides a description of how specialist preparation is required for these circumstances. Finally, it considers the role of the development of leadership standards, both in Australia and elsewhere, and recognises them as helping to shape the nature of educational leadership programmes for the future.

Lejf Moos, in 'Educating Danish School Leaders to meet New Expectations?', argues that the marketisation approach associated with the move towards New Public Management two decades ago has simply brought about a homogenisation of the approach to educating leaders in Denmark. This suggests that leading a school is no different to leading any of a range of other service agencies and so leadership education can be provided in a generic way to many people with, and from, completely different backgrounds. He suggests that another part of the reason for doing things this way is that it saves the cost of developing programmes for each of these different backgrounds.

He provides data from the 'International Successful School Principal Project' (ISSPP) and the Teaching and Learning International Survey, and information from leadership theory to articulate the current expectations that Danish authorities have for their school leaders, who are currently operating in increasingly site-based managed circumstances. He suggests that within the current framework of site-based management, there are a set of hard competencies, educational competencies, school context competencies, and social technology competencies. We can add to those the requirements that seem to emerge from the literature and the research, then both functional competencies and instructional competencies. He suggests that this list is not necessarily complete.

He indicates that formal training is not a prerequisite for appointment as a leader, but more and more the types of leadership training that are provided by the national government are general management programmes with no specific focus on education. However some school districts and local authorities are working with education providers to offer appropriate courses. Like Dinham et al., Moos argues for the need to consider context, small schools or large schools, rural or urban, multicultural or not, if we are to have the leaders we need for our rapidly changing world. The need is to focus more on leading those within the various types of schools than to homogenise educational leadership to a single portrayal of responding to government requirements.

Finally, Paula Kwan outlines the changes occurring in education and leadership preparation in Hong Kong in 'Development of School Leaders in Hong Kong: Contextual Changes and Future Challenges'. She indicates changes to the medium of instruction and secondary school curriculum that have occurred since the Chinese government assumed power and indicates that these changes, both political and actual, have led to the school principal being seen as the centre of attention when it comes to managing school change. This, in turn, has brought about changes in the way leaders are prepared and supported, including a framework that is supported financially by the government, various approaches to the delivery of programmes and an expectation that education to improve leadership becomes a career-long activity.

Hong Kong is in the unique situation of having been transferred from one form of governance (British) to another (Chinese) and is afforded the opportunity to use the best from both to establish a system that is quite different from others. After an initial focus on quantity and getting as many students into schools for as long as possible, the last 20 years has seen the Hong Kong authorities utilising what they consider to be the best approaches worldwide to improving the quality of the system as well. The role of the Education Commission (established 1984) and the impact of the school effectiveness research saw a series of reports and subsequent reforms to schools, governance, teacher education and eventually leadership development. This happened because schools became more self-managing, and many principals were unprepared for the increased responsibilities that this brought.

In the last decade, considerable work has been done in this area, and a six dimension framework (strategic direction and policy environment, teaching, learning

and curriculum, leader and teacher growth and development, staff and resource management, quality assurance and management, and external communication and connections) was developed, from which leadership preparation programmes were designed. Aspiring, newly appointed and serving principals were now all expected to undertake leadership training of various lengths and focuses. Future challenges include developing programmes for middle level managers (Assistant Principals and others) to enable them to prepare for the tasks they need to undertake, developing a succession planning model, which has been difficult in the past because of the nature of the culture of schools and leadership in them, creating the conditions where innovations are seen as opportunities rather than problems and ensuring that once in place, principals have, and act on, lifelong learning principles and practices.

The nature of the Chinese culture and the history of Hong Kong have created some difficulties as the relationships between leaders and followers need to change towards a more cooperative and involving experience. This is not only a change in education, but also a change in attitude which may take a little longer to achieve. What can we learn from this set of articles?

The articles that follow provide an excellent means of demonstrating both local and global trends in leadership development. One global trend, that impacts on all the countries in this volume, is the move towards a market orientation for education, with an underlying rationale that if schools compete for students, for resources and for achievements, then this will lead to an increase in the general level of educational achievement. In some respects this has added substantially to the range of tasks expected of school leaders. No longer can they simply manage the implementation of decisions made by others, they now have to make a range of decisions themselves, decisions about marketing, about collaboration, about the image the school wishes to project about itself, and about the development of people within the school, all of which may impact on the viability of their school.

Second, the articles identify a strong focus on accountability systems as a means of determining the success of individual schools, which has led to the need for schools to be involved in self-evaluation processes on a regular basis. This in turn, has led to decisions and analyses being made at the school level about what to do, about how well it is being done (and how we might measure this) and about what should be done next. School leaders now need to be able to oversee (if not do themselves) the identification and collection of relevant data associated with a range

of student achievements and environmental conditions, to be able to analyse and report on this data in a meaningful way that identifies successes, trends over time, and things that need to be improved and then make decisions about how to allocate resources, staffing, material and financial, in ways that will maximise the school's performance in the future.

Third, the almost universal acceptance of the importance of leadership within the school as a means of moving towards higher levels of student achievement has changed our understanding of how schools might best be led. It is clear that the task of a leader is monumental, perhaps impossible:

The task of leading a school in the twenty first century can no longer be carried out by the heroic individual leader single handedly turning schools around. It is greedy work, all consuming, demanding unrelenting peak performance from super leaders and no longer a sustainable notion. (Gronn 2003, in MacBeath 2006, 197)

Robinson, Hohepa, and Lloyd concluded in their meta analysis of leadership (2009) that a 'traditional understanding of leadership focuses on individuals in positions of authority and in a way that is rooted exclusively in individual talent'. They add, 'But thinking about leadership in a way that is tied to outcomes makes it easier to gauge if leadership is effective, as opposed to whether an individual has certain skills' (23).

And from this perspective:
Leadership is the potential outcome of interactions between groups of people rather than specific traits or skills of a single person. This definition is also more inclusive and therefore relevant to any organisation in any culture. (24)

There are many terms that have been used to describe the process whereby leadership within a school is spread from the head teacher or principal to others in the school, including distributed leadership (Gronn 2000, 2002; Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond 2001, 2004), shared leadership (Lambert 2002), democratic leadership (Starratt 2001; Møller 2002) and team leadership or teacher leadership (Little 1990; Barth 1999). The critical leadership skill in the establishment of a broader leadership base is the way in which the school leader builds capacity for leadership in other people. Again there is a substantial body of research in the literature that focuses on this topic (see Lambert 1998; Harris and Lambert 2001; Hopkins and Jackson 2001), but it is the central focus of the school leader, principal or head teacher, and the

vision that they have, that will be crucial to this exercise.

However, the articles also help us to identify different ways of doing things in the countries being considered. For instance, although there is a general trend of having leadership training prior to taking up an appointment, in some cases this is mandatory (e.g. the USA), in other cases it is not. Whereas in the USA a potential school leader must undertake a masters degree in Educational Leadership prior to even being considered for leadership, other countries enable people to be trained within the system, sometimes after their appointment to a position of leadership. In the USA educating school leaders is initially university-based, followed by localised activity through school districts, in England much of the training is delivered through the National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services, and in Scotland it is a number of universities and the education system working together for the delivery of the programme. In one case (Denmark) leaders from a variety of human service backgrounds are trained together, whereas in other countries there are programmes dedicated to leadership in schools. In England the recent addition of words to the name of the National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services recognised the need for different services to work in conjunction with each other.

However, even within dedicated training for educational leaders, the focus is very different. In Florida, Townsend and Bogotch (2008) report on the changing structure of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE), which all school leaders must pass to gain certification and which thus directs the activities of leadership preparation programs:

Of the 91 specific skills identified as part of the new statewide FELE examination, 44 of them (48%) refer to a knowledge and understanding of state or federal legislature . . . It is telling that all of the skills under Vision focus more on communication of the vision than actually developing one, that the two skills under Diversity involve following the law and state communications and that only two skills under Decision-Making Strategies make any mention of leadership at all. (225)

In Australia, the Australian Council for Educational Leaders released a draft Leadership Capability Framework (ACEL n.d.) with three major sets of imperatives for school leaders:

- Leads Self for Learning

- Leads Others for Learning
- Leads the Organisation for Learning.

Within these three imperatives, there are 11 different capabilities and 34 separate indicators and school leaders are able to map their own level of performance within a rubric for each indicator that specifies a level of performance identified as:
- Influencing within and beyond classroom
- Influencing within and beyond team
- Influencing within and beyond school
- Influencing within and globally beyond school.

Both the examples from Florida and Australia clearly show the increasing remit of expectations for school leaders. But further, it is interesting to note the differences between these two sets of expectations. In Florida, the state government's expectations are strongly focused on within-state activity (the need to know laws and policies in Florida), whereas in Australia, the national professional association for school leaders sees the task of the leader as moving beyond the school and even beyond state and national borders.

There are also different perceptions as to the major focus of leadership in schools. In both the US and Australian articles, 'instructional leadership' seems to be brought to the fore, but in the UK article, the term 'leadership for learning' takes precedence. MacBeath and Townsend (forthcoming) make the point that these two terms mean something substantially different:

Whereas much of the instructional leadership literature reduces learning to 'outcomes', leadership for learning embraces a much wider, developmental view of learning. Nor is its focus exclusively on student achievement. It sees things through a wide angle lens, embracing professional, organisational and leadership learning. It understands the vitality of their interconnections and the climate they create for exploration, inquiry and creativity. Its concern is for all of those who are part of a learning community. Clearly, although there are many common factors that are highlighted in this set of articles, these factors are largely about changes to the global understanding of the task of education. We have seen a shift towards a market approach, towards high levels of accountability, towards more responsibility in decision-making and performance at the individual school and towards a better understanding of the

importance of leadership for these approaches to be maximised. The research is unequivocal that leaders can have a powerful, if indirect, influence on student achievement (Leithwood and Jantzi 2000) because of the strong influence that leaders have on the quality of teaching (Fullan 2001; Sergiovanni 2001). Yet when it comes to the education of leaders, each country presented in these articles does things its own way. There is no common approach. This could be identified as a case of thinking globally but acting locally (Townsend 2009).

Perhaps there is a way forward towards appropriate education for school leaders who lead schools in a rapidly changing world. If leaders truly are going to serve their school in the future, the current inequity of services, resources and outcomes for a substantial proportion of the world's school population, and the lack of viability of educational systems with too many expectations and too few resources, must change. To do this leaders will need to be courageous, will need to challenge authority and may need to be subversive (MacBeath 2008, 124).

One of the keys is for school leaders to adopt what Hamel and Prahalad (1989) call strategic intent, comprising three factors:

- A sense of direction: In many organisations staff do not share a sense of purpose above and beyond the short-term unit performance, because most organisations are overmanaged and under-led. Strategic intent provides clarity about ends, but is unspecific about means.
- A sense of discovery: Strategic intent offers staff an enticing spectacle of a new destination. It is broad enough to leave room for considerable experimentation in how to reach the destination. It constrains the 'where' but not the 'how', so creativity is unbridled.
- A sense of destiny: The goal must be worthwhile to command the respect and allegiance of all the staff. Strategic intent must stimulate the passion that the staff can make a real difference. It represents an ambition that stretches beyond current resources and capabilities. (Hamel and Prahalad 1989, in Hargreaves 2006, 6)

To do this, the education of school leaders must be about more than simply managing the school. To think strategically, school leaders must have knowledge about what they have to do, but also knowledge about how to approach the unique set of circumstances and conditions that create the uniqueness of every school. Bogotch and Townsend (2008, 1) argued that true leadership is artistry and they

suggested that this was the place where the 'what' and the 'how' (or the 'whow') of school leadership comes together.

However, one real challenge facing the providers of educational leadership programmes is how to manage developing leaders who can be 'influencing within and globally beyond school' (ACEL) but at the same time prepare managers who are increasingly expected to deliver on state initiated mandates and requirements (e.g. Florida). The International Handbook on Leadership for Learning (Townsend and MacBeath, forthcoming) contains chapters from authors in many parts of the world that identify this dichotomy as perhaps the major challenge in the future. How do school leaders establish the conditions that enable a broad range of learning activity to occur within their schools, when their success as a school leader is measured solely by the achievement of students on a very narrow range of learning outcomes? The common feature of these articles is that excellent leadership at the local level is central to the task of organising schools, if high levels of student achievement are to be attained. But, as has been shown by most research, the influence of leadership on student outcomes is indirect and consequently something that has to be managed, both internally, by the leader establishing relationships with other stakeholders in (and outside) the school but also externally, as education systems try to develop school leaders that can influence student achievement.

What we see is that, despite the agreement on the level of importance of the role of school leaders, each of the countries has articulated a different way of doing things. Is one way of doing things better than another? Not necessarily. Can each learn from the others? Undoubtedly.

The way forward
One major common element identified in these articles is the need to spread the leadership as far as we can, and to create a succession planning model. I would argue that leadership preparation needs to start in undergraduate teacher education. If we see the teacher as a leader of learning, even if it is only in their own classroom, then teaching leadership skills is something that all education students should undertake (Ira Bogotch makes the same point). If teachers see themselves as leaders then the gap between the teacher and the school leader is automatically narrowed and encouraging things such as teacher leadership and involvement (a problem in Hong Kong) may become easier. Having teachers pursue other forms of leadership, from leadership in the classroom to leadership in the department, or the school, may

also be an outcome of this strategy. It may help to overcome what MacBeath identified as a dearth of people willing to take on the leadership task.

A second element identified in the articles is the need to develop strategic thinking and strategic approaches to leadership. Strategic thinking is essentially making decisions about the future based on our interpretation of the trends we see today. It could be argued that this is a shift from the approach that might be described as making decisions today based on decisions made by others in the past, which could identify the managerial approach that seems to exist in some American state governments today. Here, implementing decisions made by the state, or the school district, becomes the major role of the school leader. In this instance the leader at the school is the least powerful person in the equation, despite being the one that much of the research suggests is in the best position to make the right decision. One might suggest that the ACEL framework, which looks at leadership in classrooms, in schools, beyond schools and even beyond state and national borders might be a starting point for developing strategic thinking within a global educational system.

One other element that seems to be coming into focus is the need for leaders to share what they know and what they can do, not only with the teachers within their schools, but also outside of their schools with other leaders from different schools, different states, different countries. Instead of lowering our sights to what is happening in my school, we need to raise them to see what we might learn from (and what we might offer to) colleagues from other schools, other towns, other places.

These three elements involve different types of decisions by different people. The first one looks at how we go about providing leadership development. It involves people in teacher education making a decision about what it is that they will do to promote this. The second involves decisions on what the curriculum of educational leadership should include. Strategic leadership, just like other forms of leadership, can be studied and learned. Educational Leadership professors need to consider this as part of the curriculum they provide. The third involves decisions made by the people undertaking the leadership education programmes. This is an attitudinal change, not something that can be taught so much as something that can be learned. We need the leaders themselves to see their task as being beyond their own school as a means of ensuring the continued viability of schools themselves. If it is not

something that can be taught, it is something that can be demonstrated, and again it is the people involved in leadership preparation that need to demonstrate this. If we want our students to be global thinkers, then we must become global thinkers ourselves, and this is the key to the way forward.

If educational leadership preparation is to become what we hope it would be, then we must demonstrate by our own acts, the directions that we want our students to take. We must ask ourselves, does my list of references come from all round the world, have I used international websites as part of my teaching, have I contributed to an international conference, have I visited schools or colleagues in other countries? Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski (2010) provide a case study of a department of Educational Leadership that made the attempt to move from a group of interested individual professors to a department that saw internationalism as a key plank in their leadership education platform. This group of articles makes a further tentative step towards thinking and acting globally as well as locally, perhaps offering an encouragement for others to follow. For those of us that have been privileged to have been able to look at what is happening in other parts of the world, we can guarantee to those who haven't that the effort is worthwhile.

Notes on contributor

Tony Townsend has been professor of Public Service, Educational Leadership and Management at the University of Glasgow since January 2009. Prior to that he worked in both Australia and the USA. He has published 10 books and many articles in the areas of leadership for school effectiveness and improvement.

References

ACEL. n.d. Leadership capability framework. Sydney: Australian Council for Educational Leadership.

Barth, R.S. 1999. The teacher leader. Providence, RI: The Rhode Island Foundation.

Bogotch, I., and P. Maslin-Ostrowski. 2010. Internationalising educational leadership: How a university department jumps the curve from local to international. Educational Administration Quarterly 46, no. 2: 210_40.

Bogotch, I., and T. Townsend. 2008. What are the essential leadership questions in a rapidly changing world? In The elusive what and the problematic how: The essential leadership questions for school leaders and educational researchers, ed. T. Townsend and I. Bogotch, 3-16. Rotterdam/Taiwan: Sense Publishers.

English, F., and R. Papa. 2010. Restoring human agency to educational administration. Lancaster, PA: ProActive Publications.

Fullan, M. 2001. Leading in a culture of change. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Gronn, P. 2000. Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. Educational Management and Administration 28, no. 3: 317_38.

Gronn, P. 2002. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. Leadership Quarterly 13, no. 4: 423_51.

Gronn, P. 2003. The new work of educational leaders: Changing leadership practice in an era of school reform. London: Chapman.

Hamel, G., and C. Prahalad. 1989. Strategic intent. Harvard Business School Review 67, no. 3: 63-76.

Handy, C. 1994. The age of paradox. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Hargreaves, D. 2006. A new shape for schooling: Deep leadership 1. London: Specialist Schools and Academies Trust.

Harris, A., and L. Lambert. 2001. Building leadership capacity for school improvement. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Hopkins, D., and D. Jackson. 2001. Building the capacity for leading and learning. In Effective leadership for school improvement, ed. A. Harris, C. Day, D. Hopkins, M. Hadfield, A. Hargreaves, and C. Chapman, 84_99. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Lambert, L. 1998. Building leadership capacity in schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lambert, L. 2002. A framework for shared leadership. Educational Leadership 59, no. 8: 37-40.

Leithwood, K., and D. Janzti. 2000. The effects of transformational leadership on organisational conditions and student engagement with school. Journal of Educational Administration 38, no. 2: 112-29.

Little, J.W. 1990. The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. Teachers College Record 91, no. 4: 509-36.

MacBeath, J. 2006. The talent enigma. International Journal of Leadership in Education 9, no. 3: 183-204.

MacBeath, J. 2008. Leadership moments: How to lead. In The elusive what and the problematic how: The essential leadership questions for school leaders and educational researchers, ed. T. Townsend and I. Bogotch, 119-34. Rotterdam/Taiwan: Sense Publishers.

MacBeath, J., and T. Townsend. Forthcoming. Thinking and acting both locally and globally: What do we know now and how do we continue to improve? In The international

handbook of leadership for learning, ed. T. Townsend and J. MacBeath. New York: Springer.

Møller, J. 2002. Democratic leadership in an age of managerial accountability. In Democratic learning: The challenge to school effectiveness, ed. J. MacBeath and L. Moos, 151-63. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Robinson, V., M. Hohepa, and C. Lloyd. 2009. School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why. Best evidence synthesis. Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Education.

Sergiovanni, T. 2001. Leadership: What's in it for schools?. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Spillane, J.P., R. Halverson, and J.B. Diamond. 2001. Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. Educational Researcher 30, no. 3: 23_8.

Spillane, J.P., R. Halverson, and J.B. Diamond. 2004. Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. Journal of Curriculum Studies 36, no. 1: 3_34.

Starratt, R. 2001. Democratic leadership theory in late modernity: An oxymoron or ironic possibility? In The ethical dimension of school leadership, ed. P. Begley and O. Johansson, 333_52. Boston, MA: Kluwer Press.

Townsend, T. 2009. Third millennium leaders: Thinking and acting both locally and globally. Leadership and Policy in Schools 8, no. 4: 355_79.

Townsend, T., and I. Bogotch. 2008. Conclusion: 'What' plus 'How' equals 'Whow'. In The elusive what and the problematic how: The essential leadership questions for school leaders and educational researchers, ed. T. Townsend and I. Bogotch, 215_30. Rotterdam/Taiwan: Sense Publishers.

Townsend, T., and J. MacBeath, eds. Forthcoming. The international handbook of leadership for learning. New York: Springer.